

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-73. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 59-73.

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-18, 20-23, 31-32 and 44-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by at least one of Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 6,152,937) and Grudem (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047180).

Claim 1 requires at least one pivot bar in an anastomosis connector. A spike is mounted on the pivot bar, such that the spike is rotatable around the pivot bar.

The advantage of using a pivot bar is explained, for example, on page 10, lines 17-18 of the present application: "such that the spike can be extended into the figure plane without substantially bending the spike, only by twisting the pivot bar" and on page 14, lines 25-26: "Base 336 can serve as a pivot bar, inasmuch as the rotation of spikes 332 is supported by distortion of a significant length of base 336."

Neither Peterson nor Grudem describes a pivot bar around which a spike rotates. Rather, Peterson and Grudem describe members or bars on which spikes are mounted. The spikes themselves bend when it is desired to change their direction.

In Peterson, the members are defined as "intermediate strap portions 19 defined between each set of internal struts" (column 6, lines 19-20). Nowhere are strap portions 19 suggested to allow rotation of spikes around the strap portions. As shown in Fig. 1 of Peterson, strap portions 19 are integrally connected to struts 14 and therefore cannot serve as pivot bars, especially not pivot bars that ensure that radial deformation of the ring-like shape of the anastomosis connector does not substantially directly affect the spike rotational position, as required by claim 1.


In Grudem, spikes are mounted on members (e.g., 66a) on which spikes are mounted. Nowhere does Grudem teach or suggest that these members are pivot bars, as defined in claim 1.

The dependent claims are allowable at least because they depend on claim 1. Regarding some of the claims (2, 3, 10, 19, 24-30, 33-43, 56-58) the Examiner has indicated that they add patentability and therefore indicated that they would be allowable on their own.

088/02389 A04

In view of the above remarks, applicants believe the application is allowable. Consideration of the previously cited art and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. If the Examiner is unable to agree that the claims are all patentable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at toll free 1 (877) 428-5468. This number connects directly to our office in Israel. Please note that Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington and that our work week is Sunday-Thursday.

Respectfully submitted,
A. LOSHAKOVE, et al.



Maier Fenster
Reg. No. 41,016

June 9, 2004
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650